

capable of continuous adaptation? The single complex, after the pattern of the ocean liner, with a suburb or even a town in one massive structure, complete with its own climate, conveyors, communal restaurants, crèches, etc.—this has been for decades sketched and talked about. A prototype—le Corbusier's *unité d'habitation* at Marseilles—has even been built, and recently there were reports that the Soviet Union was planning a town under a single roof in the Arctic.

Much of this is still for the future—and no doubt, Socialism to develop. But we cannot afford to leave indefinitely the more pressing issues. For it is not by any means without protest that the planless vandalism of our ruling class is being carried out, and it is a revolutionary duty of the

working class to unite with progressive elements and give clear-sighted leadership in the Civic Societies and similar bodies which have sprung up in many towns and are at present under woolly (and sometimes reactionary) leadership. Have not the “heirs to the future” the right to be furiously indignant that while so many of us continue to live out drab lives in ugly degrading surroundings, the unique glory of our countryside, our historic towns and villages, is being destroyed by indifference and greed? Our grandfathers inherited from the finest period of English domestic and landscape architecture a country among the fairest in the world. Unless we act to rescue it now there will be little of it left for our grandchildren to enjoy.

Discussion Contributions on

Peaceful Coexistence

Patricia Davies and David Crook

IN his article, *Peaceful Coexistence*, in the October 1963 issue of *Marxism Today*, Comrade Klugmann says: “A Marxist strategy, programme, perspective, demands not only a deep understanding of Marxist ideas but their application to a specific situation in time and in space. . . .”

But his article does not contribute to a deep understanding of Marxist ideas or their application. It does not clarify issues or conform to the facts.

The title of the article is *Peaceful Coexistence*—*Burning Issue of our Time*. However, the subtitle, a quotation from the 81 Parties' Statement, shows that “the burning issue of our time” is “the problem of war and peace”, which in Marxist terms is not at all the same thing. And a little further in the article, Comrade Klugmann makes another shift of emphasis to: “Of all the issues that arise in the present epoch the most urgent is that of world peace.”

Under a sub-heading *Lenin on Peaceful Coexistence* he gives seven quotations from Lenin, not one of which mentions the words “peaceful coexistence”.

Foreign Policy of Socialist Countries

Comrade Klugmann says: “The Chinese comrades have distorted the conception of peaceful

coexistence put forward by the great majority of parties.” In the discussion at the 1960 meeting of the 81 Communist Parties, the C.P.S.U. proposed that peaceful coexistence and economic competition should form the general line of the foreign policy of the socialist countries. This view was opposed by the Chinese Party and rejected by a majority of the 81 Parties, and it was not included in the Moscow Statement. Yet at its 22nd Congress a year later, the C.P.S.U. again described peaceful coexistence as the general line of socialist foreign policy, put this principle into its own programme and tried to impose it on other parties. The C.C.P. has adhered to the 81 Parties' Statement and has included peaceful coexistence as one of the three elements in its general line for foreign policy (the other two being proletarian internationalism and support for the national liberation struggles). It has also clearly defined peaceful coexistence as being based on the five principles of mutual respect for territorial integrity and sovereignty, mutual non-aggression, non-interference in each other's internal affairs, equality and mutual benefit.

The C.C.P. is in favour of peaceful coexistence, but it does not regard it as “the supreme principle governing the life of modern society” or “the general line of foreign policy of socialist countries and Communist Parties”.

Contradictions

Consider the section of the article on Contradictions. Here, Comrade Klugmann endeavours to show that the C.C.P. ignores or underestimates the role of the socialist camp and ignores all but one of the major contradictions in the world, i.e. the one between the colonial and semi-colonial countries and imperialism.

He quotes from Lenin, outlines various contradictions in the world today and then claims that in the letter of the C.C. of the C.C.P. of June 14th, addressed to the C.C. of the C.P.S.U., "we find a quite different appreciation", namely:

"The various types of contradiction in the contemporary world are concentrated in the vast areas of Asia, Africa and Latin America; these are the most vulnerable areas under imperialist rule and the storm centres of world revolution dealing direct blows at imperialism. . . . In a sense, therefore, the whole course of the international proletarian revolution hinges on the outcome of the revolutionary struggles of the people of those areas, who constitute the overwhelming majority of the world's population."

He omits two things. One is that before this quoted passage in the letter of June 14th, there is an enumeration of all the fundamental contradictions in the contemporary world, namely, between the socialist camp and the imperialist camp, between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie in the capitalist countries, between the oppressed nations and imperialism, and the contradiction among the imperialist countries and among monopoly groups. The other omission is even more striking. The three dots in the middle of the quotation stand for the following:

"The national democratic revolutionary movement in these areas and the international socialist revolutionary movement are the two great historical currents of our time."

This omission is plain misrepresentation.

To bolster up this case, he claims that the daily *Hsinhua News* and the *Peking Review* in recent months has had "very little about the struggle of the working-class movement, the Communist Parties, the peace movement in countries like France, Italy, the U.S.A. Great Britain".

How little is "very little"? In fact, working-class struggle and other progressive activity everywhere in the world is reported in *Hsinhua*. There were, for example, eighteen items on European capitalist countries in *Hsinhua* in January. Six of them were on the first two countries mentioned.

This compares very favourably with, for example, the *Daily Worker*. In fact, none of these six items were reported in the *Daily Worker*, although they include news of the French miners'

strike (*Hsinhua*, Jan. 10th), the anti-fascist strike in Italy (*Hsinhua*, Jan. 18th) etc.

On the U.S.A., *Hsinhua* coverage is extensive, incomparably fuller than the *Daily Worker's*, especially on the heroic Negro struggle there.

And even the most cursory glance shows that *Hsinhua's* coverage of working class and progressive activity in Britain is several times greater than the *Daily Worker's* coverage on China. Indeed, it carries many items on Britain that find no space in the *Worker's* columns.

In other words there is no substance to the statement by Comrade Klugmann.

In the first paragraph of the section with the heading "Transition to Socialism as a Background to Peace", Comrade Klugmann says that the Chinese "write as if negotiation with capitalist states soiled the hands of Communists". This is just not true. Out of many items explaining the Chinese attitude towards negotiations, one can point to pages 32-35 in *Two Different Lines on the Question of War and Peace* where the statement is made: "We consistently maintain that those who refuse negotiations under all circumstances are definitely not Marxist-Leninists." And in practice, too, China has negotiated with capitalist countries on many occasions (the Korean Armistice, the Geneva talks in 1954, and in 1962 etc.). It has also had 118 ambassadorial talks with the Americans over the last eight years, dealing with the question of Taiwan, although the U.S. is in occupation of China's Taiwan and the Seventh Fleet in the Taiwan Straits is threatening China.

Nuclear Weapons

Comrade Klugmann says: "It does not help to gloss over the fact that the destructive power of nuclear weapons is something, in the Marxist sense, *qualitatively new*," and "the destructive power of modern weapons makes it imperative to exert every conceivable effort to avoid world war". But surely it was always necessary for Communists to make this effort? Tanks and poison gas in the First World War, saturation bombing in the Second World War, napalm and bacteriological war in Korea were all new. The question is who starts using them and how to manacle the imperialists who threaten to use them. And who is a more unrelenting enemy of imperialism than the Chinese?

On Cuba, he says: "At the tensest moment of the crisis the Chinese comrades issued statements implying that a 'Munich' was in process." The first implication about a "Munich" came from the lips of Cuban leaders. The Chinese supported them. This came not "at the tensest moment", but

after Khrushchov had come to his agreement with Kennedy to allow U.N. (i.e. U.S.) inspection on Cuban soil.

Comrade Klugmann spends a column on Cuba but does not mention that Khrushchov agreed to such inspection without consulting the Cubans and over their heads.

There are many other events—the Congo, Algeria, Venezuela, Laos, the Sino-Indian border, Iraq—which show the disastrous effect of placing “peaceful coexistence”, “peaceful competition” and “peaceful transition” at the centre of “a Marxist strategy, programme, perspective” (to use Comrade Klugmann’s words), in place of united world-wide struggle against imperialism.

Test Ban Treaty

On the Partial Test Ban Treaty, Comrade Klugmann says categorically, “the nuclear weapons in the possession of the Soviet Union will continue in the future, as in the past, to defend the whole socialist camp, including the People’s Republic of China, from U.S. imperialist nuclear aggression. The Soviet Government has, again and again, made that clear.” But have the Chinese no right to doubt the words of the Soviet Government after its arbitrary tearing up of agreements (on exports, on nuclear information and weapons etc.) and its supply of weapons to India?

The article makes a number of points on the Treaty but avoids the key one, namely, that the Soviet Union reversed its policy almost over-night and signed almost the same draft as was prepared earlier by the British and U.S. Governments. From among the many sharp attacks made by Khrushchov before his reversal of policy, the following statement is typical, made on September 9th, 1961:

“... the programme for developing new types of nuclear weapons which has been drawn up in the U.S. now requires precisely underground tests ... agreement on the cessation of one kind of test only—in the atmosphere—would be a disservice to the cause of peace. It would mean deceiving the peoples ... create the harmful and dangerous illusion among the peoples that steps were being taken to put an end to the arms race, while, in fact, nothing of the kind would have been done. ...”

It is significant that the *Daily Worker* reversed its policy similarly. In an editorial on June 6th, less than six weeks before the Treaty, it expressed astonishment “to learn from Mr. Wilson that the Labour Party favours a test ban which does not include underground tests”. It stated:

“This proposal is not a new one. It has also

been made by Lord Home. Those backing this idea say it would break the deadlock and be a step forward. . . . Mr. Wilson should not support these moves. He should call for a ban on all tests.”

Again, on June 11th, the *Daily Worker* said:

“Everyone knows the United States has been concentrating on underground tests to improve its nuclear weapons. If the President intends to go on with underground tests, he is continuing the suicidal race for nuclear supremacy, while in words giving the impression of peacefulness.”

Then by some extraordinary mental gymnastics, in an editorial in the same paper just a month or so later, we find: “In the absence of a total ban a partial ban is still a valuable step forward. . . .”

The Peace Movement

The section on tactics in the peace movement is just an apology for “tailism”. The Chinese are in favour of the broadest co-operation in the fight for peace. But they start from the fact (which Comrade Klugmann does not) that imperialism is the cause of war, and they never cease hammering the fact home on the principle that the only way to prevent war is to rally all possible forces to

EVERY WEEK IN

COMMENT

- ★ Facts and Figures to Fight the Tories
- ★ Arguments to Support Trade Union Claims on Hours and Wages
- ★ Essential Information for the Struggle for National Independence and Colonial Liberation
- ★ Weekly Comment on the News, Economic and Political Affairs
- ★ Book Reviews

COMMENT

A Communist Weekly Review

Sixteen pages

Price 9d.

From Central Books Ltd.,
37 Gray's Inn Road, London, W.C.1
or usual supplier

isolate imperialism, especially U.S. imperialism, and make it more and more difficult for it to unleash war.

Comrades concerned to know the point of view of the C.C.P. will obviously be better advised to read for themselves its June 14th letter and its subsequent articles commenting on the *Open*

Letter of the C.C. of the C.P.S.U.

However, Comrade Klugmann's article raises a serious problem. Can such writing be presented to British comrades as Marxism, by the editor of the Party's discussion journal, without the fullest opportunity being given for analysis and discussion?

A Rejoinder

James Klugmann

COMRADES Davies and Crook seem to me to raise a number of isolated debating points and to leave untouched the central thesis on peaceful coexistence which I put forward in my article last October. This is a pity because the fight for peaceful coexistence is so serious an issue that it deserves serious discussion.

Nuclear Weapons

I wrote that "it does not help to gloss over the fact that the destructive power of nuclear weapons is something, in the Marxist sense, *qualitatively new*". Davies and Crook do not like this formulation. There are always "new" weapons, they write, the question is who starts using them.

They studiously refuse to face the question seriously, to face reality. The fact is that the destructiveness of nuclear weapons *is* something qualitatively new and raises qualitatively new problems.

The 81 Parties Statement of 1960 said:

"Monstrous means of mass annihilation and destruction have developed which, if used in a new war, can cause unheard of destruction to entire countries and reduce key centres of world industry and culture to ruins. Such a war would bring death and suffering to hundreds of millions of people, among them people in countries not involved in it. . . ."

Comrades Crook and Davies, writing from China, may find it hard to realise this, but a nuclear war could mean the physical extermination of Britain. John Gollan, at our 28th Party Congress, said "peaceful coexistence for us is not a subject of academic debate but a condition for our continued existence".

There *is* something *qualitatively new* about the danger of a third world war and to refuse to face this is madness, not Marxism.

Real dangers, real conditions, demand a con-

centration of effort by the progressive forces of the whole world to stop imperialism dragging us into a third world war. This means that the fight for peaceful coexistence is a burning, urgent, central issue. It is verbal quibbling to oppose, as Crook and Davies do, the fight for peaceful coexistence to "the problem of war or peace".

New Relation of Class Forces

If Comrades Crook and Davies avoid the issue of the destructive power of nuclear weapons, they also hide from the equally fundamental issue of the new relation of class forces in the world.

The essential case that I made in my October article was that not only is it essential to fight for peaceful coexistence, to *impose* peace by mass struggle on the imperialists driving to war, but that the new relation of class forces in the world, the growth of the forces of socialism and peace, makes such a perspective possible. There is both the *need and the possibility*.

Comrades Crook and Davies accuse me of distorting the position of the Chinese Communist Party on the contradictions in the world today. But, in fact, events since I wrote that article, have only confirmed what I wrote last October. The leaders of the Chinese Communist Party are trying to separate the national liberation struggle and the peoples of the colonial and newly independent countries from most of the countries of the socialist world and from the working class in the imperialist countries.

In fact it is not just that the Chinese comrades do not see the essential contradiction between the socialist world and imperialism. In their speeches and writings and publications, they are virtually "writing off" a great part of the socialist world. If you read attentively what is published on the U.S.S.R. in the daily *Hsinhua News* or in the main Chinese Party statements, you will find *nothing* of the magnificent socialist construction, of the